

DRAWINGS

Please replace the sheet containing Figure 5 with the attached replacement sheet.

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 29, 2006. In that action: claims 1-61 were pending; the drawings were objected to regarding the labeling of Figure 5; the abstract was objected to; claims 12, 17, 25, 42, and 48 were objected to due to informalities; claims 12 and 42 were rejected under 35 USC 112; claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 31, 32, 37, and 38 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Emery (USPN 5,610,972) in view of Lawson (USPN 5,721,825); and claims 3-6, 9-30, 33-36, and 39-61 were objected to but noted as allowable if rewritten to not depend from the rejected claims.

The Abstract has been amended. Figure 5 has been replaced with a replacement sheet having a corrected Figure 5. Claims 1, 3, 12, 17, 20, 24, 25, 31-33, 42, 47, 48, 50, 54, 55, and 57 have been amended. Claims 1 and 31 are amended to even further distinguish over the prior art, claims 3, 33, and 57 are amended into independent form, claims 12 and 42 are amended to address the Section 112 rejection and claim objections, claims 17, 25, and 48 are amended to address the claim objections, and claims 20, 24, 32, 47, 50, 54, and 55 are amended to place them in better form. Reconsideration of the rejected claims and allowance of the case is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 31, 32, 37, and 38 have been rejected based on the combination of Emery and Lawson. Emery teaches an integrated services control point (ISCP) which receives a registration list from another ISCP. Claim 1 recites an Association Controller (AC) that receives an event registration list (ERL) from an Integrated Services Controller (ISC).

The Examiner states that Emery teaches all the elements of claim 1 except for the ERL, that Emery merely teaches a registration list, and that since Lawson teaches an event registration list, it would have been obvious to combine the two references, "in order to provide a list of events to be performed by the network element." (See Office Action, p 5).

First of all these 2 references are non-analogous art. Lawson teaches an event notification system between computers in a distributed computer system, and does not mention telephony, or telecom systems (see Lawson, column 1, lines 13-17). Emery teaches a service which allows a user to send and receive telephone calls from a single handset whether at home or roaming. (see Emery, column 1, lines 12-18). A person of skill in the art would not be motivated to look to the art of distributed computer systems to improve on Emery.

Second, even if one were to combine these 2 references, they would not have the claimed invention or even a suggestion of it. At a minimum, this is because an ISCP is not the same as an AC. First, the AC operates in the transport control layer whereas the ISC and ISCP operate in the service layer. Moreover, the AC abstracts for services the ability to control, manage, and affect transport resources in a service and technology neutral manner. That is, the AC can uniformly support multiple communication services independent of communication type. On the other hand, the primary function of the ISCP is to keep track of the present location and profile of a particular telephone handset.

The Examiner cites column 21, lines 41-50 of Emery as teaching the “registering of one or more events from the one or more communication services which have a notification interest in said event.” However, the cited section of Emery relates to the screening of telephone calls. Additionally, the word “event” does not even appear anywhere in Emery. For all of these reasons, claims 1 and 31 (and all claims ultimately dependent thereon) are patentable.

Furthermore, claims 2 and 32 are patentable for additional reasons. The Examiner states that Emery teaches at least one AC further configured to dynamically receive a registration through an interactive exchange with each of the system entities which have a notification interest in said at least one event (see column 27, lines 24-30). This section relates to a Signal Switching Point (SSP) communicating registration information to an ISCP. The Examiner also relies on Lawson to include an “event registration list.” Again, the Examiner is arguing that an ISCP is the same as an AC, so most of the arguments above apply. Also, Emery relates to registration of a service, not an event registration list.

Also, claims 7 and 37 are patentable for additional reasons. These claims relate to an AC configured for auto-discovery of event notifications that can be delivered to an ISC on behalf of a service logic entity. The Examiner cites column 27, lines 4-9 of Emery. That section relates to the automatic registration of a service for a telephone handset.

Still further, claims 8 and 38 are patentable for additional reasons. These claims relate to an AC configured to dynamically augment or modify an ERL through negotiation of the registration of an event with an ISC on behalf of a service logic entity. The Examiner cites column 28, lines 21-28 of Emery. That section relates to an ISCP filtering instructions that are not compatible with a particular service.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: /Robert G. Crouch/
Robert G. Crouch
Registration No. 34,806
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
Telephone: 720-562-5506

Date: September 20, 2006